UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/688,075	10/17/2003	Thomas Huber	2050.085US1	8165

44367   7590   02/21/2008
SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG & WOESSNER/OPEN TV
P.O. BOX 2938
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-0938

EXAMINER
THOMAS, JASON

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2623	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
02/21/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS,
WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *17 October 2003*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
    closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-16* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-16* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *17 October 2003* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

        1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

        2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

        3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
           application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date *03/08/04, 11/03/04, 03/04/05, 12/03/07*.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* **v.** *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148

USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining

obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating
   obviousness or nonobviousness.

1.   Claims 1, 2, 4 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over 6257 in view of 5671.

Regarding claim 1: Slezak discloses a method of presenting advertising

in a subscriber broadcast system comprising: offering an upgraded advertising

service (see [column 3 line 63 - column 4 line 4], [column 8 lines 29-32]);

receiving subscriptions to said upgraded advertising service (see [column 3 line

63 - column 4 line 4], [column 8 lines 29-32], [column 10 lines 59-60], [column 11

lines 14-17] where selecting a full, half, or no charge is a subscription to

upgrade); and receiving a plurality of video feeds including a plurality of

advertisements (see [figs 4a-4d], [column 5 lines 11-16], [column 5 lines 42-44], [column 11 lines 55-58]).

Slezak does not explicitly teach: delivering set top box computer program code to a plurality of upgraded advertising service subscribers; providing indicators for at least two advertisements of said plurality of advertisements wherein said indicators include a priority level and a category for a corresponding advertisement; or broadcasting a video signal comprising program content, said plurality of advertisements, and said indicators for at least two advertisements of said plurality of advertisements to a plurality of set top boxes.

Morrison teaches: delivering set top box computer program code to a plurality of upgraded advertising service subscribers (see [figs 3a & 3b], [table 1], [column 3 lines 16-34], [column 3 lines 39-48] for receivers which receive code for a plurality of said subscribers); providing indicators for at least two advertisements of said plurality of advertisements wherein said indicators include a priority level and a category for a corresponding advertisement (see [column 3 lines 39-48] for providing flag indicators; see also [column 5 line 67 – column 6 line 5] where a hierarchical database categorizes and prioritizes received data containing indicators; or broadcasting a video signal comprising program content, said plurality of advertisements, and said indicators for at least two advertisements of said plurality of advertisements to a plurality of set top boxes (see [figs 4a-4d], [figs 3a-3b], [table 1], [column 3 lines 16-34], [column 3 lines

39-48], [column 4 lines 46-55] for broadcasting a video signal comprising said data to a plurality of receivers).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide: set top box code; advertisement indicators which include corresponding advertisement data; and a video signal which is broadcasted containing said content, as taught in Morrison, when delivering a subscriber broadcast system, as taught in Slezak, because broadcasted entertainment services generally transmit video signals which contain coded data, commonly including indicators which are associated with the content they describe (see Morrison [column 3 lines 5-15]).

Regarding claim 2: Slezak does not explicitly teach receiving a request for an advertising category from at least one subscriber of said plurality of subscribers.

Morrison teaches receiving a request for an advertising category from at least one subscriber of said plurality of subscribers (see [column 3 lines 16-39], [column 5 line 67- column 6 line 5] where one of multiple users/subscribers of the plurality of receivers make a request).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to receive requests for a specific advertising category from one or multiple subscribers, as taught in Morrison, when delivering a subscriber broadcast system, as taught in Slezak, because allowing the subscriber to make

requests allows the incoming materials to better meet the desired parameters of the user (see Morrison [column 1 lines 57-67]).

Regarding claim 4: Slezak does not explicitly teach downloading an advertisement and corresponding indicator to local storage of a set top box.

Morrison teaches downloading an advertisement and corresponding indicator to local storage of a set top box (see [fig 2 item 28], [column 3 lines 16-34], [column 3 lines 39-48] where commercials are downloaded to the receiver's storage along with the respective flag indicator).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide the ability to download advertisement contents to the receiver storage, as taught in Morrison, when delivering a subscriber broadcast system, as taught in Slezak, because the user may not wish to view the incoming materials the moment they are received (see Morrison [column 1 lines 57-67]).

Regarding claim 6: Slezak discloses a method for displaying user selected advertising in a subscriber broadcast system comprising: determining if said standard advertisement may be replaced with an upgraded advertisement (see [column 2 lines 23-34], [column 3 line 63 - column 4 line 4]); accessing upgraded advertisement content if it is determined that said standard advertisement may be replaced with an upgraded advertisement (see [column 4 lines 9-13], [column 5 lines 11-15]; and displaying said upgraded advertisement

content if it is determined that staid standard advertisement may be replaced with an upgraded advertisement (see [column 9 lines 38-43]).

Slezak does not explicitly teach: requesting a category of advertisement from a plurality of advertisement categories; or receiving a video signal comprising program content, a standard advertisement, and an advertisement indicator.

Morrison teaches: requesting a category of advertisement from a plurality of advertisement categories (see [column 5 line 67- column 6 line 5]); and receiving a video signal comprising program content, a standard advertisement, and an advertisement indicator (see [column 3 lines 15-34], [column 4 lines 46-55]).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide a method for a user to request a category and receive a video signal comprising incoming content, as taught in Morrison, when delivering a subscriber broadcast system, as taught in Slezak, because allowing the subscriber to make requests allows the incoming video material to better meet the desired parameters of the user (see Morrison [column 1 lines 57-67]).

2.   Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over 6257 in view of 5671 and 5591.

Regarding claim 5: Slezak discloses selecting said plurality of advertisements based upon demographic characteristics (see [column 1 lines 35-

38], [column 4 lines 4-9], [column 8 lines 32-39], [column 11 lines 59-62]) but does not teach where said characteristics are of said plurality of set top boxes.

Wachob teaches demographic characteristics which are stored specific to the receiver (converter) rather than an external source (see [column 5 line 64 - column 6 line 5], [column 6 lines 15-17]).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to store demographic attributes directly on the receiver, as taught in Wachob, in order to better select advertisements based upon demographic characteristics, as taught in Slezak, because this would allow the receiver to be able to determine the most suitable content at any given instant (see Wachob [column 5 line 64 - column 6 line 5]).

3.   Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over 6257 in view of 5671 and 3443.

Regarding claim 3: Slezak does not explicitly teach broadcasting an advertising indicator that includes a network address for an advertisement that can be accessed across a network.

Morrison teaches broadcasting an advertising indicator (see [column 39-51 but does not explicitly teach wherein the indicator includes a network address for an advertisement that can be accessed across a network.

Eldering teaches advertisements that can be retrieved using a network address (see [abstract], [0031], [0067]).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include a network address in the advertising indicator, as taught in Eldering, when broadcasting said indicators, as taught in Slezak, because this would allow for more space to be reserved for storing non-advertisement contents in local storage.

4.   Claims 7 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over 6257 in view of 5671 and 8330.

Regarding claims 7: Slezak discloses an upgraded advertising production system comprising: a processor (see [column 7 lines 26-40] for a cpu); an advertisement detector receiving a video feed comprising program content and advertising (see [column 5 lines 11-26], [column 6 lines 25-47] for determining when to interrupt a movie with advertising and what advertising programming to use); a channel multiplexer that receives said program content, at least one advertisement and that formats said program content, said advertisement (see [fig. 10], [column 3 lines 29-32], [column 6 lines 25-47], [column 10 lines 52-66]); and a transmitter that transmits said program content, said advertisement (see [fig. 4 item 96], [column 7 lines 54-65], [column 11 lines 52-67]).

Slezak does not explicitly disclose an advertisement indicator which is used associated with the advertisement.

Morrison teaches where an advertisement indicator is associated with the advertisement (see [column 3 lines 39-55], [column 5 lines 7-8]).

Morrison does not explicitly disclose an advertisement indicator editor that can create, modify, and delete at least one advertisement indicator associated with an advertisement contained in said video fee.

Goetz teaches an advertisement indicator editor that can create, modify, and delete at least one advertisement indicator associated with an advertisement contained in said video feed (see [column 10 lines 7-14]).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide the ability to modify advertisement indicators, as taught in Goetz, which are associated with advertisement content, as taught in Morrison, when delivering an advertising production system, as taught in Slezak, because this eases the management and control of multimedia presentations and distribution (see [column 2 lines 59-66].

Regarding claims 14: Slezak discloses an upgraded advertising production system comprising: processing means (see [column 7 lines 26-40] for a cpu); means for detecting an advertising period in a video feed (see [column 5 lines 11-26], [column 6 lines 25-47]); multiplexer means that receive said edited video feed and accesses advertising content and that formats said edited video feed and said advertising content for transmission (see [fig. 10], [column 3 lines 29-32], [column 6 lines 25-47], [column 10 lines 52-66]); and transmission means that transmits said edited video feed and said advertising content (see [fig. 4 item 96], [column 7 lines 54-65], [column 11 lines 52-67]).

Slezak does not explicitly disclose an advertisement indicator which is used associated with the advertisement.

Morrison teaches where an advertisement indicator is associated with the advertisement (see [column 3 lines 39-55], [column 5 lines 7-8]).

Morrison does not teach editing means that can create, modify, and delete an advertisement indicator associated with said video feed to produce an edited video feed.

Goetz teaches an advertisement indicator editor that can create, modify, and delete at least one advertisement indicator associated with an advertisement contained in said video feed (see [column 10 lines 7-14]).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide means to modify advertisement indicators, as taught in Goetz, which are associated with advertisement content, as taught in Morrison, when delivering an advertising production system, as taught in Slezak, because this eases the management and control of multimedia presentations and distribution (see [column 2 lines 59-66].

5.   Claims 8, 12, 13 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over 6257 in view of 5671.

Regarding claim 8: Slezak discloses a set top box that selectively displays upgraded advertising comprising: a processor (see [column 8 lines 5-10] for a cpu); an audio/video processor that outputs audio and video signals to a display unit (see [column 3 lines 45-52], [column 4 lines 45-48], [column 8 lines

1-17]); and a tuner controlled by said processor that receives a video input (see

[column 8 lines 13-14] for an NTSC tuner).

Slezak does not explicitly teach: a tuner controlled by said processor that

receives a video input comprising program content wherein the program content

comprises a first advertisement, a first advertisement indicator, a second

advertisement, and a second advertisement indicator wherein said first

advertisement indicator and said second advertisement indicator both include a

category of the advertisement and a priority level; a first computer program code

operating on said processor that detects said first advertisement indicator and

said second advertisement indicator and compares the category of said first

advertisement and the category of said second advertisement to a stored

category value and that compares the priority level of said first advertisement

with the priority level of said second advertisement and that selects said first

advertisement unless the category of said second advertisement is in agreement

with said stored category value and the priority level of said second

advertisement is greater than or equal to said priority level of said first

advertisement; second computer program code that provides said first

advertisement to said audio/video processor if said first advertisement is selected

and that accesses and provides said second advertisement to said audio/video

processor if said second advertisement is selected.

Morrison teaches: a tuner controlled by said processor that receives a

video input comprising program content wherein the program content comprises

a first advertisement, a first advertisement indicator, a second advertisement,

and a second advertisement indicator wherein said first advertisement indicator

and said second advertisement indicator both include a category of the

advertisement and a priority level (see [fig. 2 item 12], [column 3 lines 16-55],

[column 5 lines 1-14]); a first computer program code operating on said

processor that detects said first advertisement indicator and said second

advertisement indicator and compares the category of said first advertisement

and the category of said second advertisement to a stored category value and

that compares the priority level of said first advertisement with the priority level of

said second advertisement and that selects said first advertisement unless the

category of said second advertisement is in agreement with said stored category

value and the priority level of said second advertisement is greater than or equal

to said priority level of said first advertisement (see [figs. 5 and 6], [column 3 lines

16-55], [column 5 line 67—column 6 line 5]); second computer program code that

provides said first advertisement to said audio/video processor if said first

advertisement is selected and that accesses and provides said second

advertisement to said audio/video processor if said second advertisement is

selected (see [figs. 5 and 6], [column 3 lines 16-55], [column 5 line 67 - column 6

line 5]).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art to provide: a tuner which is controllable; advertisement

indicators which contain characteristics of the incoming advertisement contents;

and code that is able to make use of the incoming indicator information by comparing said information, as taught in Morrison, when delivering a subscriber broadcast system, as taught in Slezak, because a tuner must be controlled by a processing device and it is common for such a controlled tuner to be capable of receiving contents which contain coded items such as indicators and said tuner (see [column 3 lines 5-15]), furthermore it would be expected that some program is necessary to detect and process said indicators in order to create some order amongst the incoming material based on included category and priority information (see Morrison [column 1 lines 62-67], [column 5 line 67 - column 6 line 5]).

Regarding claim 12: Slezak discloses wherein said second computer program code further comprises code that acquires said second advertisement across a network (see [fig. 1], [column 4 lines 49-58], [column 5 lines 1-10] for acquiring secondary programming across a network).

Regarding claim 13: Slezak discloses a video combiner that combines a portion of said first advertisement with a portion of said second advertisement (see [fig. 10], [column 10 lines 61-64]).

Regarding claim 15: Slezak discloses a set top box that selectively displays upgraded advertising comprising: processor means (see [column 8 lines 5-10] for a cpu); audio/video processing means that output audio and video signals to a display unit (see [column 3 lines 45-52], [column 4 lines 45-48],

[column 8 lines 1-17]); tuning means (see [column 8 lines 13-14] for an NTSC tuner).

Slezak does not disclose tuning means controlled by said processor means that receive a video input comprising program content, a first advertisement, a first advertisement indicator, a second advertisement, and a second advertisement indicator wherein said first advertisement indicator and said second advertisement indicator both include a category of the advertisement and a priority level ; computer program code means operating on said processor that detect said first advertisement indicator and said second advertisement indicator and that compare the category of said first advertisement and the category of said second advertisement to a stored category value and that compare the priority level of said first advertisement with the priority level of said second advertisement and that select said first advertisement unless the category of said second advertisement is in agreement with said stored category value and the priority level of said second advertisement is greater than or equal to said priority level of said first advertisement; second computer program code means that provide said first advertisement to said audio/video processor if said first advertisement is selected and that accesses and provide said second advertisement to said audio/video processor if said second advertisement is selected.

Morrison teaches: a tuner controlled by said processor that receives a video input comprising program content wherein the program content comprises

a first advertisement, a first advertisement indicator, a second advertisement, and a second advertisement indicator wherein said first advertisement indicator and said second advertisement indicator both include a category of the advertisement and a priority level (see [fig. 2 item 12], [column 3 lines 16-55], [column 5 lines 1-14]); a first computer program code operating on said processor that detects said first advertisement indicator and said second advertisement indicator and compares the category of said first advertisement and the category of said second advertisement to a stored category value and that compares the priority level of said first advertisement with the priority level of said second advertisement and that selects said first advertisement unless the category of said second advertisement is in agreement with said stored category value and the priority level of said second advertisement is greater than or equal to said priority level of said first advertisement (see [figs. 5 and 6], [column 3 lines 16-55], [column 5 line 67—column 6 line 5]); second computer program code that provides said first advertisement to said audio/video processor if said first advertisement is selected and that accesses and provides said second advertisement to said audio/video processor if said second advertisement is selected (see [figs. 5 and 6], [column 3 lines 16-55], [column 5 line 67 - column 6 line 5]).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide means for: a tuner which is controllable; advertisement indicators which contain characteristics of the incoming

advertisement contents; and code that is able to make use of the incoming

indicator information by comparing said information, as taught in Morrison, when

delivering a subscriber broadcast system, as taught in Slezak, because a tuner

must be controlled by a processing device and it is common for such a controlled

tuner to be capable of receiving contents which contain coded items such as

indicators and said tuner (see [column 3 lines 5-15]), furthermore it would be

expected that some program is necessary to detect and process said indicators

in order to create some order amongst the incoming material based on included

category and priority information (see Morrison [column 1 lines 62-67], [column 5

line 67 - column 6 line 5]).

6.   Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over 6257 in

view of 5671.

Regarding claim 9: Slezak does not teach a computer program code that

processes a user input and stores said stored category value in said set top box.

Morrison teaches a computer program code that processes a user input

and stores said stored category value in said set top box (see [table 1], [column 3

line 16-39], [column 7 lines 20-35]).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art to provide code to process a user input which request a

specific category, as taught in Morrison, when delivering a subscriber broadcast

system, as taught in Slezak, because allowing the subscriber to make specific

requests based on category and a hierarchical arrangement allows the incoming

video material to better meet the desired parameters of the user (see Morrison

[column 1 lines 57-67], [column 5 line 67 – column 6 line 5]).

7.   Claims 10 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over 6257 in view of 5591.

Regarding claim 10: Slezak does not teach computer program code that

recognizes a remote control input as being specific to one user and selects said

stored category value from a plurality of stored category values based upon an

identifier of said one user.

Wachob teaches means implicit of executable instructions that recognize

a remote control input as being specific to one user and selects said stored

category value from a plurality of stored category values based upon an identifier

of said one user (see [figs. 2 & 4], [column 1 lines 48-55], [column 2 lines 10-23],

[column 2 lines 37-42]).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art to provide a means for identifying multiple users, as taught

in Wachob, when delivering a subscriber broadcast system, as taught in Slezak,

because it is common for multiple viewers with differing preference to live in the

same location and use the same display apparatus (see Wachob [column 2 lines

13-17], [column 2 lines 37-40]).

Regarding claim 11: Slezak does not disclose a second computer

program code further comprises code that adjusts said tuner to receive said

second advertisement.

Wachob teaches control functions (programming code) that further comprise adjusting said tuner to receive said second advertisement (see [column 4 lines 41-55], [column 6 lines 50-67]).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to adjust a tuner to tune to another channel, as taught in Wachob, to view an alternate advertisement, as taught in Slezak, because such methods are well known to those skilled in the art (see [column 4 lines 45-49]).

8.   Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over 5671 in view of 5591.

Regarding claim 16: Morrison discloses a method of operating a subscriber broadcast system comprising: defining a plurality of advertising categories (see [fig. 5 items 90 & 94], [column 3 lines 2-4], [column 5 line 67 – column 6 line 5]; receiving user requests for said advertising categories (see [column 5 line 67 – column 6 line 5]); transmitting program content and advertisements with advertisement indicators allowing selection of advertisements at a set top box (see [column 3 lines 16-55]; and determining a count of advertisements viewed in each category of said plurality of advertising categories (see [column 3 lines 62-63]).

Morrison does not teach creating a billing statement reflecting said count of advertisements in each category.

Wachob teaches providing billing data, from accurate commercial tracking, which reflects said count of advertisements (see [column 2 lines 43-48], [column 3 lines 48-51], [column 9 lines 15-19], [column 10 lines 27-28]).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide billing data, as taught in Wachob, when delivering a subscriber broadcast system, as taught in Morrison, because this would be expected, when alternating which commercials are displayed based on user data, to provide market research functions and enable accurate billing of advertisers for the commercials presented to the users (see [column 2 lines 43-48]).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JASON THOMAS whose telephone number is (571) 270-5080. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon. - Thurs., 8:00 a.m. - 5:00 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dennis Chow can be reached on (571) 272-7767. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

J. Thomas

/Dennis-Doon   Chow/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 4126